

MARGINAL ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

(G.) Mr. C O S T A R D's

Two Late Dissertations

ON THE

KESITAH and the HERMAI.

Εἰς ὑμῶν ἔστιν ὁ καὶ θνητῆς, ὁ Χριστός.

Matt. xxiii. 10.



L O N D O N :

Printed for E. WITHERS, at the *Seven Stars*, next the
Inner Temple-Gate, Fleet-Street. M.DCC.L.

[Price Six-pence.]

MARGINALIA

ON

Mr. COLEMAN

Two Late Editions

ON THE

KESLAW and the HERMAN

As the only copy of the
first edition is in the
possession of the
British Museum



LONDON
Printed for E. WILKINS, at the Strand, near the
West Tower Gate, E.C.4.
[Price sixpence]

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader is desired to observe, that the Quotations are given more at Length, that he may not have the Trouble of being continually referred to the Piece here animadverted upon.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader is desired to observe, that the Quotations are given more at length, than he may not have the Trouble of being continually referred to the Piece here advertised upon.



Marginal Animadversions, &c.

PAGE 1. line 1. "The Book of *Job*
 " is undoubtedly one of the finest
 " Remains of Antiquity." What
 Remains of Antiquity does he mean?

The Books of the S. S. exclusive of the oldest
 Heathen Books? Or these taken in the Lump
 with those?

1st, If he means the Books of S. S. taken so
 exclusively, his seeming Commendation, or
 Preference of the Book of *Job*, is a real Piece of
 Impertinence. Because the S. Books are not to
 be compared one with another, among them-
 selves, especially for what he calls *fine*. For they
 are all from one Author, God himself; and are
 infinitely above the Imbellishment this Writer
 had in his Head, viz. that of an oratorial or
 poetic *Fineness*; and do despise it.

2dly, If he means the S. Books, taken in the
 Lump with the old Heathen Books, his Com-
 parison is profane: It is setting the Dreams of
 the *Pagans* upon a Level with the Dictates of
 the *Holy Ghost*.

Ibid. l. 20. "Whoever would prove this Book to be older than *Moses* from the *Kesitab* being mentioned in it, must take upon him to prove, that it was a Coin out of use in *Job's* Country ever since the Time of that Lawgiver." It is by no means incumbent upon the Person he means, to take upon him the Proof of this Negative. He may very reasonably and fairly suppose it. Let those, whose Cause it concerns, prove the Affirmative to the contrary.

P. 2. l. 3. "And must likewise assert, that the Writer, in order to give his Poem the Air of Antiquity, could not introduce the mention of such a Coin, tho' laid aside, he knew, many hundred Years before he was born." He may very well, and I dare answer, as readily will assert this. Because, to mention such a Coin so laid aside, to give his Poem an Air of Antiquity, to which it had no Title, had been to impose an Untruth upon the World: which as the Book of *Job* is Part of the Book of God, the sacred Penman of it could not possibly do; as the Gentleman this Writer has been nibbling at, will at any Time tell him, if he has not already sufficiently told him so all thro' *Elibu*.

Ibid. l. 12. "I flatter myself however, that to all rational Enquirers, I have said enough to shew, that any *mystical* Arguments, at least, drawn from the *supposed* Stamp upon it, are absolutely without Foundation." A pious Writer in better Times would have flatter-

ed himself (that is, he would have rejoiced) just in the Reverse, *viz.* that he discerned a Mystery, and knew the Reason of it. He would never have gloried, that he could shew a Matter, taken by other faithful Christians for mystical, to be absolutely without Foundation. And has not the Lamb been regarded by all such Christians as a mystical Animal, mystical of the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World?

Ibid. l. 21. "As the best Way of coming
 " at the Truth, in Cases where we have but
 " little Light to guide us, will be, by con-
 " sidering such as are better understood; if
 " they bear any Resemblance to each other."
 This may be a good Help to illustrate, and confirm the Truth, if, in Cases *Revealed* and *Paganic*, the latter appear to have any Dependance on the former. But People should take Care how they make the true *πρότερον* to be *ὑστερον*. For that a Thing either is, or is otherwise, *hic et nunc*, can teach us nothing about the Being of Things that were *olim*, et *alibi*, et *aliâ prorsus ratione*.

Ibid. at Bottom. "The Argument, I think,
 " is now brought within as small a Compass as
 " it well can be." What Argument? What has this Gentleman to do with the *Kesita*? Who ever wrote against him upon that Subject? What Hurt has the Mysticalness of the *Kesita* done him, that he fetches about such a strange Device of an Argument, (*i. e.* of a Controversy) dropt out of the Cieling, without naming
 B 3 against

against whom, or about what, or for what Reason? Dr. *Hodges* had published a Book of great Reach and Comprehension on the Book of *Job*, without concerning himself with the trivial Pamphlets, or Digressions of our minute Writers on that divine Book; and brought an Argument (amongst others) for the Antiquity of the Book, taken from the *Kesita* as explained by other learned Authors, and farther illustrated and applied by himself. What Envy, or what Itch of Scribbling moved this Author to throw about his mishapen Impertinencies, against a Design so pious, so generous, and interesting to the Christian World?

P. 3. l. 5. "In *Italy*, if we believe *Macrobius*," &c. *Italy*, and even *Greece*, were scarcely peopled, much less reduced to any civil Policy, till many Ages after the Times in question, in which the *Kesita* is understood to have been current among the People of God. To what purpose then is his beating the Air about the first Coins to be met with in those Countries, no Body knows how many Ages below the Time he had to consider?

Ibid. "If we believe *Macrobius*, the first "Coiner of Money was *Janus*." *Janus* was a fabulous Person; and therefore no Author is to be believed, that tells us such a Person coined Money. Nevertheless, what *Macrobius*, and such like Writers say to that purpose, is of Authority to those that produce them, to prove that there was a Tradition of coined Money having been

in use in those Countries, in the fabulous Ages. Which is against what this Gentleman wants here to insinuate against the Antiquity of coined Money in general.

P. 4. Not. 2. l. 5. " In *Spanheim* there is a " large oblong Piece of Money of *five Asse*, " stampd on both Sides with the Figure of an " Ox." This is only a good Proof, against himself, of the Antiquity of the Custom of stamping Money with the Figures of such Animals; and so is a presumptive Argument for the Lamb on the *Kesita*: Such Customs of latter Ages, and more Western Countries, having been in most Cases derived from Eastern, and more ancient.

Ibid. at Bottom. " But still this is uncertain," &c. His Business was to make every thing uncertain: But this is exceeding trifling. The Coin he talks of was not the *Athenians Peculium*: No, it was the *Delians*, as much as theirs; or rather, it was the *Delians* before it was theirs, In the mean time, as to the *mystic* Reason of the Stamp (the Ox) which is the Thing that so gravels these People, the *Scholiast* on *Homer* Il. β . says, " The Reason wherefore " these Animals were stampd on those Coins, " was, that they were *sacred Ones*." At the same Time he supposes *Homer* to have mentioned these Ox-Coins, as generally current in the Time of the *Trojan War*.

P. 6. l. 1. " How soon the *Greeks* became " acquainted with the Art of *striking* Money,

" is

“ is yet more uncertain. But probably, not
 “ till either Commerce began to flourish among
 “ them, or they had occasion to pay large
 “ Armies abroad.” The *Greek* Pieces of Money
 called Oxen, (besides the Proofs above produ-
 ced) were not only current at, but before the
 Time of the *Trojan* War ; being referred by
Plutarch to *Theseus*.

Ibid. Not. 1. 17. “ But as there were two
 “ *Phidons*, what is ascribed to the former by
 “ the Marble, may really belong to the latter.”
 This *may* is *gratis* supposed, against the Evidence
 himself has produced ; which therefore must
 stand such as it is, and avail as it may.

Ibid. l. 9. “ According to *Ælian*, and *Epho-*
 “ *rus* in *Strabo*, it was first introduced into
 “ *Ægina* by *Phaidon*, who was the first Person
 “ that stamped an *Image* upon it. P. 7. Not. 1.
 “ l. 1. This is not agreed on.” The Tradition
 disagrees in some Particulars ; but in general the
 Whole of it tends to refer Coining to the fabu-
 lous Ages.

P. 9. l. 5. “ Tho’ *Beger* thinks this Coin
 “ was struck by *Phidon* in his Life-time, yet
 “ *Sperlingius* is rather inclined to think, that
 “ the Letters $\Phi I \Delta O$ refer to the Cup, as being
 “ of that Sort, which were called so, perhaps,
 “ from him as the Inventer.” It might be a
 new Coin, with the old Stamp, and new Let-
 ters. The best here is but guess’d Work.

P. 10. l. 3. “ The oldest *Greek* Coin extant,
 “ according to *F. Harduin* in his *Chronology* of
 “ the

"the Old Testament, is one of *Amyntas*, the
 "6th in his Order of *Macedonian Kings*."
 No Argument is to be drawn against the An-
 tiquity of Coining itself, from the Coins found
 in the present *Archives*; when one considers,
 how it could not but happen, that once in a
 few Centuries, new Sets of Coins must have
 been still introduced on the Destruction of the
 old, which were from Time to Time lost, or
 melted down, and destroyed. See *Budæus de*
Assæ, P. 665. and a Law of *Justinian* to this
 Purpose there cited by him.

P. 12. l. 8. "That the first stamping of
 "Money with an Effigies, in *Asia*, is to be
 "placed somewhere about this Time, (*viz.*
 "the taking of *Babylon* by *Cyrus*) is not im-
 "probable." Since his Head will run on Pro-
 babilities, it is much more probable that two, or
 three, or even many more Sets of Coins had,
 in most of the *Asiatic* States, been lost, or de-
 stroyed, before this Time.

Ibid. l. 12. "At the Time of the *Jews*
 "Captivity by *Nebuchadnezzar*, &c. *Jeremiah*
 "purchased his Cousin's Land for seven *Shekel*
 "and ten *חבצלת Cheseph*, or *Silverlings*. P. 13.
 "l. 4. But that neither of them were stamped,
 "I think, appears from hence, that they were
 "weighed." What an Inference is this from
Jeremiah's weighing the *Shekel*! The *Shekel*
 was a known Coin, and of a certain Standard
 Weight, many Ages at least before this Trans-
 action, as no Body can dispute. And *Jeré-*
miah's

miah's weighing them on the Occasion of his Purchase was either to give the greater Notoriety and Authenticity to the Transaction; or because the Current Money was then grown old, and much worn away, and therefore was weighed after the Manner of uncoined Pieces, or *Bullion*, as we now weigh our old Money, in Exchange with the Goldsmiths, or otherwise.

Ibid. at Bottom, and 14. at Top. "But that the Money there in use was at this Time *unstamped*, appears from hence, that in the Apology which *Joseph's* Brethren made to his Steward, &c. they tell him, that they found it, &c. in their Sacks Mouth, במשקלו *in its full weight.*" Nothing of this appears at all; for they would speak after this Manner, tho' they only told their Money without weighing it: This Form of speaking being continued from the original Custom of weighing uncoined Money; as also because some Weight is still the Standard of all Money. Thus we say, so many Pounds, or Marks, *sterling*, i. e. from a Standard Weight, so called. So במשקלו signifies only according to its *Shekels*, or according to the *Shekel-Standard*.

Ibid. l. 13. "We read of the *Shekel*, and the *Chefeph*, i. e. I suppose, the *Shekel* and its *Divisions*, as early as we have any Account of Trade." This proves every Tittle of it, against him, that there was Money at that Time current *in Tale*, and *not weighed*; and such Money, in an Age that talked and wrote by
Symbols,

Symbols, and marked every thing with some *Sign*, is not to be supposed to have been *uncharacterized*.

P. 15. l. 5. " But as he (*Abraham*) weighed them, it is plain again, their *Value* was determined by the Scale, and not by any Stamp upon them." It does not follow that he weighed them; the Term *weighing* being probably used for *telling*, for the Reasons above assigned. Indeed, *current Money with the Merchant*, in the same Text, implies this; and Mr. *Costard* himself says, it means, that the Pieces were of full weight. Which is owning that they had their stated Weight, that by that Weight they were rendered current, and therefore, in fact, were not weighed in common Traffick, but told.

Ibid. l. 22. " St. *Stephen*, speaking of this Bargain, seems to say indefinitely, that he bought the Land *τιμῆς ἀργυρίου*, for a Sum of Money, say our Translators, and this perhaps was all that he intended." What would this mean? St. *Stephen* speaks definitely of the Matter, coined Money, tho' indefinitely of the Sum, or Quantity. Neither does *ἀργύριον*, when put substantively, signify any thing else but Money only. No Matter therefore what was the Value of the Pieces of this Money referred to by the *Proto-Martyr*; the Point is, whether the Word *ἀργύριον* signified coined Money definitely, or uncoined Metal indefinitely; about which the Gentleman afterwards

wards makes a Pother : And of that, any one may be satisfied, that will turn over a Concordance and a Lexicon.

P. 17. He gives us the *Septuagint*, *Arabic*, *Syriac*, *Onkelos*, and *Aben Ezra's* Version of the *Kesita* in the Book of *Job*; who all translate it by words signifying a *Sheep*, or a *Lamb* : Which is good Evidence, 1st. That the Word *וֶשֶׁת* did signify that sacred Animal; and 2dly. (taking in the Exposition of *St. Stephen*) that the *Lamb* in question was a Coin, so called from the Figure of the same stamped upon it. By the bye, how came he to dream of a *Targum* of *Onkelos* on the Book of *Job*? When *Onkelos* paraphrased only the Books of the Law; and the *Targums* upon *Job*, the *Psalms*, and the *Proverbs*, are said to have been the Work of *Joseph the one-ey'd*. *Onkelos* had certainly nothing to do with them. But,

The Original says — *Job's* Friends gave him each a *Lamb* (as afore said) and an *Ear-ring* of Gold. So here were two Gifts; 1st. The said *Lamb*, whatever it was, and 2dly. the *Ear-ring* of Gold, whatever it was. And accordingly all the Translators give us two distinct Rendrings for these two distinct Things. We have seen the Rendrings of the former, the *Kesita*; let us see those of the latter, the *Ear-ring*; for which the *Vulg.* has *inaurem auream unam*. *Chaldee Paraphrast*, קְדִשָּׁן דְּדָהָבָא, *an holy Thing of Gold*, i. e. eminently and particularly an *Ear-ring*, that being usually reckon-

ed

ed among their sacred Things. The very same Rendring gives the Syriac. Arab. an *Earring*, or *small Weight of Gold*. LXX τετραδραχμον χρυσῆ καὶ ἀσήμῃ, a *Tetradrachm of Gold, and unstamped*: Which Olympiodorus explains by σταθμὸν ἀτύπαιτον καὶ ἀχαρακτήριστον, a *certain Weight, unstamped and unfigured*. The LXX therefore thus translated this latter Piece, to express wherein it differed from the former; this being an *uncoined Piece of Bullion*, whereas the former was *coined Money*, stamped with the Figure of a *Lamb*: These Interpreters plainly adding to the *Tetradrachm Piece*, the *Nexem* of the Original, the Epithets *unstamped*, and *unfigured*, to distinguish it from the *Kesita*, or *Lamb-Piece*, as stamped with the Figure of the Animal whose Name it bore.

Nothing can be plainer. There are two Particulars mentioned in the Original, and two in each of the Translations. The Translators, some of them, render a little after the Manner of Expositors, to inform us of what Sorts they took the Pieces severally to be; but neither dropt or confounded the Things, or omitted, or added, or changed their Places. Yet Mr. Costard, when in the LXX there are two sensible Rendrings for two Things, tells us—Ay, but he thinks, they meant to omit one of the said two, and give both their Rendrings, *ex superabundante*, to the other: Which argues an unaccountable Perverseness either in his Will, or Understanding. The Word ἀμνάδα plainly is

the Translation of *Kesita*, and *παραδεδειγμεν* of *Nexem*; and yet both shall seem to him to be but Translations of *Kesita*, and *Nexem* shall have no Translation at all. This Jumble exists only in his own Perverseness, as aforesaid.

Ibid. Not. 2. " See a remarkable Instance " of such a Jumble as this, *Habak. iii. 2.*" He should have told us, how that in *Habakuk* was such a Jumble as he pretends this in *Job* to be. This in *Job*, he pretends, is a Case of two Particulars mentioned in the Original; for one of which the LXX have given two Translations, and left the other untranslated. But no such thing appears, either in *Job*, or in his similar Example in *Habakuk*. The *Septuagint* Version of the Passage in *Habakuk* differs (as indeed it often does) from the Original. But there is no Difference however of this Sort. Mr. *Costard* therefore is guilty of a double Perversion; in bringing one Jumble to exemplify another, where neither this or that have any Being, but in his own intricate Invention.

P. 18. l. 2. " But if קשיתא never signifies " a *Lamb*, as *Bochart* very rightly observes, " then that could not be the Reason of the " Appellation, whatever else was." That the Root of *Kesita* signifies a *Lamb*, or *Sheep*, we have the Authority of all the Translators; against which *Bochart* has no Right to enter any Negative. And I think there are other Proofs of the same, which I may touch elsewhere.

Ibid.

Ibid. 1. 5. " This was most probably a "*Canaanitish* Coin." Why so? Why, as he tells us, for two Reasons. 1st. Because it must have been such Money, as was current in the Country where *Jacob* made the Purchase. 2dly. Because it is not credible, that such a single small Family as *Jacob's* was, should have a Coin of their own. Now is not this to guess, or devise any Nonsense, only to cast Disrespect upon the Patriarchal Family? The *Canaanites* had owned *Jacob's* Father to be a *mighty Prince*, a *Prince of the Elabim* among them; and was not *Jacob* the same among the *Shechemites*? And in worldly Respects he was certainly much greater than many in several Ages, and some near our own Times, who have coined their own Money. Every Shop-keeper in *England* did it but a few Years ago. But why might not the *Kesita*, or *Shekel*, whether they were the same, or different Coins, have come originally from Believers, and from them have been current all over the *East*, till the Days of *Jacob*? That the *Kesita* was a Coin made use of by *Jacob*, and stamped with the Lamb, we have the conjunct Testimony of the LXX and St. *Stephen*. They who would prove any Negation of this, must produce some Authority at least as good. But all other Histories in this Case being silent, the S. S. explained by the LXX, hath the Possession alone, and must keep it. To what Purpose is talking of Negatives, about the *Canaanites*, *Egyptians*, *Babylonians*,

Ionians, &c. whose ancient Histories and Coins, whatever they were, are all long since dead, and buried in Oblivion? Let them that want them, fetch them again *ab Inferis*, if they know how, and produce them. For my part, I am content to let them remain where they are. But what, after all, can he mean by *Canaanite Money*? For although the Border of the *Canaanites* was originally, according to *Gen. x. 19.* from *Sidon* (so named from the First-born of *Canaan*) unto *Gaza*, &c. yet after the Expulsion of such of them, as inhabited the Northern and Eastern Parts of that Region which adjoins to *Syria* and *Arabia*, by *Joshua*, there was probably little or no Communication between *Job's* Country, and that Part which was subdued, and spoiled by *Joshua*; much less can we suppose, that a Race so accursed, and hateful, would supply Believers with Money for religious, or even common Uses; or indeed that Nations, so broken to Pieces, had any Right or Power of Coinage. After this dreadful Extirpation, the *Canaanites* were probably confined to the Coasts of the *Mediterranean*, or however reached no further Eastward, till *Solomon* gave them a little more Room, by his Present of twenty Cities to *Hiram*, called the Land of *Cabul*; tho' they made other Settlements Westward. But their national Title then, and for many Ages afterwards, was *Phœnicians*, or *Tyrians*, tho' some particular Persons, who came from among them, went by the Name of

of their first Founder *Canaan*, as *Simon the Canaanite*, &c. So that had they coined any Money, as they probably did, it must have been called *Phœnician*, not *Canaanite Money*. If Mr. *Coffard* therefore supposes, that *Job* lived so low as the Time of *Ezra*, he will find it hard to prove that there was any Money called *Canaanite Money*; and it is absurd to suppose, that the *Canaanitish* Nations, bordering formerly upon *Job's* Country, had any Sort of Money or Possessions, as a Nation. So that his *Kefitas*, to make good his *Hypothesis*, must be fetched from the Coast of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, quite across the Land of *Judea*, to that of *Arabia*, or rather from the North-West Point of that Tract, to the South East. *Credant Infideles!* But this Writer perhaps may talk of *Job* and his Country, only for the Sake of being more easily understood ('tis to be wished he could always take care to be so) when he is concerned in an *Argument*, or Controversy, with Believers: Whereas he may possibly think that *Job* is a *fabulous Hero*, and the Book an *Apolo- gue*, or *moral Fable*. Thus he may get off clean, and make his escape.

Now follows a fetch of Criticism very extraordinary. Page. 18. at Bottom, and P. 19. He would have the * LXX to be corrupted in

Gen.

* " The oldest Version extant of this Place is the LXX. which,
 " if corrupted itself, would naturally corrupt such Versions as
 " followed it, *Gen.* xxxi. 7. *Jacob* complains to his Wife, that
 " her Father had changed his Wages עשרת מנים *ten times*.
 " This the LXX. perhaps, rendred originally, ἑλλαξί τὸν μι-
 " σθός

Gen. xxxi. 7. to infer its Corruption in *Gen.* xxxiii. 19. But this not quite satisfying, he would suppose an Error in the *Hebrew* itself; in the Management of which, he shews a Degree of Effrontery and Profaneness, fit to undertake any thing. This therefore, with his great Store of *if's*, *perhaps's*, *might be's*, *justly suspect's*, &c. are beneath the Notice of all Men of Sense, and Honesty.

P. 19. at Bottom. "We are equally in the "Dark as to its Value." The Value was probably that of a young Lamb, as some learned Men have supposed, *i. e.* about a *Shekel* of the *Sanctuary*.

What he talks afterwards of the *Meah*, and *Kesita*, is egregious Impertinence, beating the Air of Imagination, and proving Nothing.

But not wholly to pass over in Silence, *Gen.* xxxi 7. *He hath changed my Wages ten Times.*

Heb.
 " $\sigma\delta\acute{o}\nu \mu\epsilon \delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha$ MNΩN, taking the Word מִנִּי to signify the
 " *Attic* MNA or Pound, a Term they were well acquainted with.
 " But the A in ΔΕΚΑ *might*, by Transcribers, especially in
 " Copies where there were no Distinction of Words, be easily
 " joined to the succeeding Word MNΩN, and so make ΔΕΚ'
 " AMNΩN, or $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha \alpha\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, as we read now in that Place. And
 " it is nothing more, *perhaps*, than the same Mistake repeated
 " in the Place under Consideration. But, *perhaps*, the Error
 " *might be* in the *Hebrew* itself, where, from the manifest V-
 " ariety there appears upon many Occasions in the Numbers, we
 " may *justly suspect* they were expressed by Abbreviations, or nu-
 " meral Letters. If this last was the Case here in *Genesis*, and in-
 " stead of קִשְׁטָה במאה קִשְׁטָה, it was wrote only קִשְׁטָה
 " the ק in קִשְׁטָה, immediately following another, might
 " easily be dropt by a Transcriber, and by that means קִשְׁטָה
 " changed into קִשְׁטָה, and so mistook by the Translator for
 " שִׁטָּה or שִׁתָּה, which in the *Chaldee* signifies a *Shep.*
 " And accordingly it is so explained in the *Targum* by another
 " Word of the same Import."

Heb. ten מנ"ה — The Words may be rendered literally, either ten *Minæ*, Pounds, or ten Numbers, Distributions, or Computations; LXX δέξα ἀμνάσις, ten Lambs, i. e. ten Pieces of Money, stamped with the Figure of the Lamb; which, probably often serving also for Counters to reckon with, they called the Numbers themselves by that Name; and hence *Aquila* renders, without a Figure, δέξα ἀριθμοίς, ten Numbers. From the *Heb.* מנה comes the Greek μνα, the Latin *Mina*, *Moneta*, and our *Money*. So from the Verb of the same Letters inverted, as says *Avenarius*, comes the Greek νημιω; whence νομισμα, the Latin, *Nummus*, *numero*, &c.

St. Austin says, the LXX rendered ten Lambs, for ten eaning Times, as the *Latins* said *post aliquot Aristas*, to express the Number of Years, or Times, with the Species of Things [Lambs] of which *Laban* had endeavoured to defraud *Jacob*; which carries a better Shew of Learning, than any I have seen in *Mr. Costard*.

P. 22, 23. He makes a Pother about the Meaning of the Word קרב — *Psalms* lx. 6. and *Proverbs* xxii. 21. where it stands amongst Words of the highest mystic Meanings; and therefore an *Anti-Mystic* is not likely to understand any thing of it. In both those Places it signifies the Lamb slain before the Foundation of the World, or alludes to it; as may be shewn at leisure.

P. 23. at Bottom. He talks of *secondary Senses*, without considering the *primary Acts* and *Dispensations* of God ; and so can't but utter *vain things*. In this Part he also tells us, that the Verb *נָסַח* does not now occur in *Hebrew*, but in his *Arabic* : and thither goes he a hunting for the primary Idea of it, talks of one or two other *Arabic* Words, nothing to the Purpose, and at last, finding nothing, goes to guessing (as usual) to find the Root he wants.

P. 25. at Top, says he, " This, as well " as the rest, are in this Language too, *derivative* Senses only, from what SEEMS " to have been the *primary* one, *directus fuit*." So the infinite *Arabic* (it *seems*) falls short too, and wants to be eeked out from the more than infinite Stores of a critical Invention.

P. 25. l. 9. " Since it is an *essential* Property of the *Ballance* to be *strait*, it came " very naturally to signify to *weigh*, and thence " to *distribute equally*, and to *be just*." He equivocates. The Straitness he talks of does not mean *Directness*, in Opposition to *Obliquity*, but *Rectitude*, or *Equality*, in Opposition to *Deficiency* in Weight, Tale, &c.

Ibid. infra. " Of the *Canaanites*, the *Sbekel*, " and the *Kasat*." The *Canaanites* in this Matter are an *Ens Rationis*, of Mr. Costard's own Creation ; and the *Sbekel* was certainly coined Money, current by Tale, tho' still reducible to Weight, and proved by a Standard Weight. To which add, that whatever Affinity

nity the *Kesita* had to the *Shekel*, *שֶׁקֶל* in *Heb.* signifies not to weigh, let it signify in *Arabic* hot and cold, and whatever they will besides.

P. 26. l. 2. "The *Jewish* Historian," &c. Who or what does he mean by his *Jewish* Historian? *Jews*, in *Moses's* Days, was not the Name of the Nation.

Ibid. l. 3. "Ephron and his *Canaanites* might call it a *Kesitab*." They might call it a *Meab*, or a *Cheseph*, for ought he knows; but he has no Authority to guess any thing.

P. 27. l. 8. "But then it very naturally accounts for our hearing so little of the *Kesitab*, and so frequently of the *Shekel*, during the whole Time that the *Hebrew* Republick lasted." It accounts naturally for nothing at all, but that the *Shekel* and *Kesita* are the oldest Coins we hear of, that the same were used among Believers (who were prior to Infidels) and that therefore probably it was carried off from them, by the said Infidels, in most of the Eastern Nations. But it could be no *Peculium* of the *Canaanites*, seeing both *Job's* Friends had it, who were no *Canaanites*. Mean while I suppose the Antiquity of the Book of *Job*, as proved by Dr. *Hodges*, and not to be disproved by Mr. *Costard*.

P. 28. l. 2. "And from the Time that the poor Remains of that People (the *Canaanites*) were intirely subdued by that Prince (*David*) we may well suppose the Coin of the Conqueror's own Value and De-

D 2

" nomination

“ nomination prevailed every where through-
 “ out that Country.” This is all a Piece of
 Impertinence, as to the Matter he urges; it
 gives a Reason, against himself, wherefore there
 are no more ancient Coins extant, than we now
 find. Conquerors have destroyed the Coins of
 the Nations over and over, and therefore we
 have none, in Comparison, but modern Coins,
 from which such as Mr. *Costard* are not to be
 allowed to infer any of their Inferences.

Ibid. l. 10. “ If some of these *Canaanites* fled
 “ from their Conquerors into *Lybia*, others of
 “ them, *it is likely*, went into *Arabia*, towards
 “ *Babylon* and the *Euphrates*, where they car-
 “ ried their *Kesitab* along with them, and
 “ continued their mercantile Way of Life.
 “ Here the Author of the Book of *Job* might
 “ renew his Acquaintance with that Word,
 “ and with great Propriety apply it to the Per-
 “ sons he was then speaking of.” *Might!* is for
 Fairy-Land: but who then was the Author of
 the Book of *Job*? Why some *Jew* of the *Ba-*
bylonish Captivity in *Chaldæa*; who in some
Terra incognita, in a Wood in *Chaldæa*, or the
 Parts adjacent, found some of the Race, the
 Coins, Manners, and Dialect of the old *Ca-*
naanites, who had fled thither so many Ages
 before, and remained there settled [*incognito*]
 ‘till that Time. See how some People can
 entertain themselves with their waking Dreams,
 to evade and avoid the Truth, however plainly
 set before them!

Ibid,

Ibid. at Bottom. " If it could be made appear, that the *Kesitab* was of *Gold* in the Time when the Author of the Book of *Job* wrote, and that the *Greek* Translator of it had any Authority for rendring it *τερεάδεαχμον χρυσῶν ἀσημιον*, it would be a farther Proof of the Lateness of that Composition, and might be added to the other Arguments, I have formerly offered upon that Head." Only one thing wants in this Place to be made appear; which is, that Mr. *Costard* had any Authority, or even any Grounds, so much as in common Sense, for making the LXX render *Kesita* by *τερεάδεαχμον*, &c. to which any Man that can read, has Authority to return a direct and simple Denial, without any farther Reasoning, or Disputing.

P. 30. l. 5. " For we read of *Staters* called by his (*Craesus's*) Name." But this proves nothing, that there were not *Staters* struck by other Princes of that Country before. Tho' there are several Reasons (as we have seen) wherefore there are now none of the former ones extant.

P. 31. l. 2. " When the Translator," &c. This has been struck off with due Indignation already.

Ibid. l. 9. " The mean *Attic Tetradrachm*," &c. This may be Learning, but the Author only makes full Speed with it out of his Road.

P. 32. l. 13. " He (the Translator of the *Septuagint*) adds, &c. that it (the *Tetradrachma*)

"*drachma*) was ἀρνίον." No, no, not the *Kesita*, but the *Nezem*.

Ibid. l. 15. "And it would have been absurd to the last Degree to have assigned it a Stamp used by the *Greeks* or *Romans*, at the Time when this Translation was made. A Rock which those Writers have most unfortunately split upon, who have rendered קֶשִׁיטָה a *Lamb*." How weak is this? What Denial can it be to the *Lamb* on the *Kesita* in *Jacob's* Time, that the *Lamb*, *Sheep*, *Ox*, &c. have been found on some *Greek*, or *Roman* Coins, in some latter Times? Is it so strange, or singular, for latter Times to imitate earlier? For Unbelievers to mimic Believers?

Ibid. at Bottom. "For that the *Arabians*, or Borderers upon them, one of whom *Job* seems to have been, ever stamped any Figures of *Animals* upon their Coins at all, is more than can be proved, at this Distance of Time." We know nothing now but of the modern *Arabs*; whose Affairs are all of yesterday: among which, they have no Coins stamped with *Animals*. May be so; but what is that to the Stamp of the *Kesita*, among the ancient Inhabitants of some of the Countries, since called *Arabia*? Where, according to very sufficient Evidence, they had the *Lamb* current among them.

P. 33. Not. 1. "Before the Times of the *Caliphs* we find a Coin of *Antoninus Pius*," &c.

&c. What are all these Things to us on the present Question?

P. 34. l. 4. "The oldest Coin extant doth not appear to go higher than the Age of Cyrus." This may be true; but is egregiously impertinent; since there are older Coins on Record, that are lost.

P. 35. l. 1. "That the Word *Kesitab* never signifieth a *Lamb* or a *Sheep*, or any *Animal* whatever in the *Hebrew*, *Chaldee*, *Syriac*, or *Arabic* Languages." And yet the LXX, St. *Jerom*, the *Chaldee*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, and all have rendered it by—a *Lamb*, or a *Sheep*.

Ibid infra. "That the LXX Version, as it is called, where at present it is so rendered, hath either been corrupted by Transcribers—or was made from a faulty or obscure *Hebrew* Copy—or lastly, that the Authors of it, not understanding the Word כֶּסֶת, and knowing that in the early Ages of the World Bargains were made by way of Barter and Exchange, have rendred it a *Lamb* by Conjecture only." All *gratis dicta*, and presumptuously.

P. 35. at Bottom. 36. at Top. "The Word *Kesitab*, most probably indeed, signifies a Coin, &c.—cannot be proved to have been a *Jewish* one." *Jewish*! is worse than impertinent. But he will still have it to have been *Canaanite* Money, that it may have no Connection with the Law of *Moses*: Whereas no Mortal knows any thing of the old *Canaanites* Money.

Money. It was plainly a Coin used by Believers, and, as appears by its Currency, among Unbelievers also, who received it, as they did numberless Customs and Things, from the former, and abused them; and then they laid them aside, as Dr. *Hodges* rightly, and judiciously hath observed.

DISSERTATION II.

P. 38. l. 9. " In the early Ages of the
 " World, &c. it was usual, when Property
 " began, to distinguish the Bounds of People's
 " Possessions by Land-marks, which were no-
 " thing but small Heaps of Stones, laid at proper
 " Distances from each other. These were
 " each of them called ערמה, *Aremab* or *Ar-*
 " *mab*." Whence has he all this? The Word
 ערמה is used for *some Heaps*; but how, or
 where, for *Heaps of Stones* in particular? And
 how yet more particularly for Land-marks?
 All his own Citations following shew the *Her-*
metic Heaps of Stones he talks of to have
 been used about *Roads*, not *Land-marks*. In
 short, he begs here two Questions, on which
 all that follows is built. 1st. That the most
 ancient Land-marks were only *Heaps of Stones*,
 thrown to the Place. 2dly. That *Arma* was
 the Name by which these *Heaps of Stones* were
 called: Which Foundations being taken away,
 the whole Superstructure built upon them falls,
 and comes to nothing, but an *Heap* of imper-
 tinent useless Learning. Under-

Underneath is a *Note*, in which he makes a kind of mixt Language of the *Hebrew* and other *Eastern Dialects* in common, not only without Proof, but against the most copious Evidence, both divine and human, that perhaps any Matter of Fact in the World can boast.

P. 39. l. 4. " Agreeable to the Simplicity " and public Honesty of that Age." To do Honour to the divine Law and Word, the farthest he can go is, to lower it in Character to the *Simplicity and public Honesty of that Age*, i. e. of the *Heathens* of that Age: And what was that, but to do every thing, that to the Lord God of *Israel* was abominable, and hateful?

All the Notes *Ibid*, *infra*, and P. 40. prove, that the *Stones* he talks of were thrown to some Image of *Mercury*, as President, or Protector of the Roads, Travellers, &c. that they were not changed for such Image, afterwards. Neither were the Heaps themselves ever called 'Ερμ' or 'Ερμαι', but were Appendages to some one Stone, or Image, set up for an *Hermes*. Nor had they any Respect to *Land-marks*, but to *Roads* only; whence the Proverb 'Ερμαῖον for unexpected Good Luck, taken from a Traveller's unexpectedly lighting on one of these *Heaps*, with a *Mercury* to direct him in the Way, when he was in danger of losing it. See *Suid*. 'Ερμαῖον ἐν τερουχνηέναι, to light on a Mercury's Heap, Image, &c.

P. 41. l. 4. "*Ore rotundo.*" Ἐπεὰ πῆροδεντα and Ἑρμαϊκὴ σῆρα, I have heard of ; but an *Hermes's Heap of Words*, for the Power of Eloquence, I think, never.

Ibid. l. 18. "Fable and Mythology, &c. "know no Bounds." The *Mythology* himself has given is boundless, and without Foundation also.

P. 42. l. 6. "The Verb. טלע," &c. Not this, but the Root תלה is the Root for the Name *Atlas*, who had the Heavens *suspended* upon his Back.

P. 43. l. 1. "*Maia.*" See the *History of the Heavens*, P. 191. where מאר the *Hundred*, or *Multitude*, is as good, if not a better Etymology.

P. 44. l. 8. "מאר is a Term," &c. *Mar* at present signifies a *Saint*; and therefore 2500 Years ago, it must have signified an *Heathen God*! Pretty Reasoning for Critics! Query, is not this modern *Mar*, a *Saint*, only a *Mutilation* of the Word *Martyr*?

Ibid. infra. To combat his Nonsense on מאר חור, See *Hist. of the Heavens*, P. 186. and *Hutchinson's Mos. Princip.* Pt. 2d. P. 313.

P. 45. l. 5. "From רכל *racal.*" See *Hist. of the Heavens*, and *Hutchinson*, as above.

Ibid. l. 20. "ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ," &c. This Name is made by Inversion of כל-אור, the *Light going thro' all the Signs of the Zodiac*, as see *Orpheus's Hymn* on this Idol.

But

But I have overlooked his *Du'l-Akal*; *Du*, he says, signifies *Dominus*, and *Akal*, *Eloquencia*, or *Wisdom*. But the *Arabic*, I am told, never signifies any thing uniform, or of a Piece. *Du*, as derived from several *Hebrew* Roots, signifies several Things—as from דוד languit, it signifies *Sickness*; from יד Sufficiency [a divine Attribute] it signifies *Lord*, &c. So his *Akal* signifies *Wisdom*; but it is the *tortuous*, *crooked Wisdom* of the *Serpent*. Which at last brings us back to what the Name *Hermes* was originally taken from, viz. the old *crooked Serpent* and his Works; as Dr. *Hodges* hath before shewn. Let him, and his *Arabs*, make the best of their vague Stuff.

P. 47. l. 13. “ It is beginning at the wrong “ End,” &c. The right Course is, to begin at the Original; and go down thro’ the derived Languages, and consider the Dependancies, Deflexions, Agreements, Misapplications in the derived, and corrupted Dialects; to which however, the *Arabic* will conduce little, or nothing. Because there are none of the old Monuments of Idolatry preserved in that Language, and the Words, under each Root, appear to be a mismatched Hodge-Podge of Derivations from many Roots, no way related to each other: so that no one of their copious Roots can never be brought to any Agreement with itself; but you must carry back the Derivatives, given under it in the *Arabic* Lexicons, to their respective true Roots in the
Hebrew,

Hebrew, with the Help of the *Chaldee* and *Syriac* Dialects also sometimes called in : and then something may be made of the chaotic Jumble of *Arabic* ; tho' nothing to answer the Pains it will require, to bring its Medley to any tolerable Arrangement.

F I N I S.

